UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,100	08/21/2003	Zahir Saidi	34074.00887LDSE.09.US.CI	P 8648
61214 Fox Rothschild.	7590 03/09/201 ¹ , LLP	0	EXAMINER	
Elan Pharma International Limited			SOROUSH, LAYLA	
997 Lenox Drive, Bldg. #3 Lawrenceville, NJ 08648			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/09/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/019,100	SAIDI ET AL.			
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	LAYLA SOROUSH	1627			
All Participants:	Status of Application: App	peal Brief			
(1) <u>LAYLA SOROUSH</u> .	(3)				
(2) <u>Vyacheslav V Vasilyev</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 18 February 2010	Time:				
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:					
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed:					
Claims discussed: All claims of record Prior art documents discussed:					
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet					
Part III.					
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte cord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview			
/SREENI PADMANABHAN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1627					
(A _I	oplicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's question regarding the status of claims was addressed. The discussion entailed whether Applicant was in fact required to submit the full listing of claims and status identifiers for the Appeal Brief submitted on 11/09/09. The Applicant was directed to the MPEP and notified that the Appeal Brief was defective due to the lack of status identifiers and full listing of claims.